



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**THORPE NORTH & WESTERN**  
**8180 SOUTH 700 EAST, SUITE 200**  
**P.O. BOX 1219**  
**SANDY, UT 84070**

**COPY MAILED**

**OCT 28 2005**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of	:
Steven A. Johnson et al	:
Application No. 10/615,569	: DECISION ON PETITION
Filed: July 7, 2003	: UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3)
Attorney Docket No. 22027.CON	:

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3), filed September 12, 2005, to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. § 120 for the benefit of priority to the prior-filed nonprovisional applications set forth in the amendment filed concurrently with the instant petition.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

A petition for acceptance of a claim for late priority under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after the expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii). In addition, the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. § 120 and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(i) of the prior-filed application(s), unless previously submitted;
- (2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

The instant petition does not comply with item (1) above.

A reference to add the above-noted, prior-filed applications on page one following the first sentence of the specification has been included in a concurrently filed amendment. However, the amendment is not acceptable as drafted since it improperly incorporates by reference the prior-filed applications. Petitioner's attention is directed to Dart Industries v. Banner, 636 F.2d 684,

207 USPQ 273 (C.A.D.C. 1980), where the court drew a distinction between a permissible 35 U.S.C. § 120 statement and the impermissible introduction of new matter by way of incorporation by reference in a 35 U.S.C. § 120 statement. The court specifically stated:

Section 120 merely provides a mechanism whereby an application becomes entitled to benefit of the filing date of an earlier application disclosing the same subject matter. Common subject matter must be disclosed, in both applications, either specifically or by an express incorporation-by-reference of prior disclosed subject matter. Nothing in section 120 itself operates to carry forward any disclosure from an earlier application. In re deSeversky, *supra* at 674, 177 USPQ at 146-147. Section 120 contains no magical disclosure-augmenting powers able to pierce new matter barriers. It cannot, therefore, "limit" the absolute and express prohibition against new matter contained in section 251.

In order for the incorporation by reference statement to be effective as a proper safeguard against the omission of a portion of a prior application, the incorporation by reference statement must be included in the specification-as-filed, or in an amendment specifically referred to in an oath or declaration executing the application. *See In re deSeversky, supra. Note also* MPEP 201.06(c)).

Further, petitioner is advised that, where an application claims a benefit under 35 U.S.C. 120 of a chain of applications, the application must make a reference to the first (earliest) application and every intermediate application. *See Sampson v. Ampex Corp.*, 463 F.2d 1042, 1044-45, 174 USPQ 417, 418-19 (2d Cir. 1972); Sticker Indus. Supply Corp. v. Blaw-Knox Co., 405 F.2d 90, 93, 160 USPQ 177, 179 (7th Cir. 1968); Hovlid v. Asari, 305 F.2d 747, 751, 134 USPQ 162, 165 (9th Cir. 1962). *See also* MPEP § 201.11. In addition, every intermediate application must also make a reference to the first (earliest) application and every application after the first application and before such intermediate application. MPEP Section 201.06(d). Petitioner should review the claim submitted to ensure that a reference is made to the first application and to every intermediate application.

Accordingly, before the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) can be granted, a substitute amendment<sup>1</sup> deleting the incorporation by reference statement, along with a renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3), is required.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail:                      Mail Stop PETITIONS

---


<sup>1</sup> Note 37 CFR 1.121

Commissioner for Patents  
Post Office Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand: Customer Service Window  
Mail Stop Petitions  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

By fax: (571) 272-3220  
ATTN: Office of Petitions

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to Wan Laymon at (571) 272-3220.

  
Frances Hicks  
Lead Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions